ATTACHMENT A

FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

The information contained in this transmission is privileged and confidential. It is intended only for the use of the individual or entity named below. If the reader of this message is not the intended recipient or the employee or agent responsible for delivering the message to the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited.

If you have received this communication in error, please notify Gen-Probe immediately by telephone and return the original message to us at the below-indicated address via regular U.S. mail. Thank you.

FROM: Charles B. Cappellari
Gen-Probe Incorporated
10210 Genetic Center Drive
San Diego, California 92121
Phone No. (858) 410-8927
Facsimile No. (858) 410-8928

TO: **Examiner: Sisson, B.**
Group 1634

U.S. Patent & Trademark Office

Facsimile No. (703) 872-9306

Number of pages (including this cover page): 21

In re Patent Application of:	Group Art Unit: 1634
MICHAEL M. BECKER	Examiner: Sisson, B.
Serial No. 10/020,596	Atty. Docket No. GP123-02.UT
Filed: December 7, 2001	Confirmation No. 6565
Title: METHOD FOR ENHANCING THE ASSOCIATION RATES OF POLYNUCLEOTIDES	Date: January 24, 2005

Transmitted herewith are:

1) Transmittal Form PTO/SB/21 (1 pg.); and
2) Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 (19 pgs.)

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence (and any referred to as attached) is being sent by facsimile to 703-872-9306 on the date indicated below to the Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Date: January 24, 2005

By: _____
Charles B. Cappellari
Registration No. 40,937
Attorney for Applicant

PTO/SB/21 (09-04)
Approved for use through 07/31/2006. OMB 0651-0031
U.S. Patent and Trademark Office; U.S. DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

TRANSMITTAL FORM

(to be used for all correspondence after initial filing)

Total Number of Pages in This Submission: 21

Application Number	10/020,596
Filing Date	December 7, 2001
First Named Inventor	Michael M. Becker
Art Unit	1634
Examiner Name	Sisson, B.
Attorney Docket Number	GP123-02.UT

ENCLOSURES *(Check all that apply)*

- ☐ Fee Transmittal Form
  - ☐ Fee Attached
- ☑ Amendment/Reply
  - ☑ After Final
  - ☐ Affidavits/declaration(s)
- ☐ Extension of Time Request
- ☐ Express Abandonment Request
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement
- ☐ Certified Copy of Priority Document(s)
- ☐ Reply to Missing Parts/ Incomplete Application
  - ☐ Reply to Missing Parts under 37 CFR 1.52 or 1.53
- ☐ Drawing(s)
- ☐ Licensing-related Papers
- ☐ Petition
- ☐ Petition to Convert to a Provisional Application
- ☐ Power of Attorney, Revocation Change of Correspondence Address
- ☐ Terminal Disclaimer
- ☐ Request for Refund
- ☐ CD, Number of CD(s) _____
  - ☐ Landscape Table on CD
- ☐ After Allowance Communication to TC
- ☐ Appeal Communication to Board of Appeals and Interferences
- ☐ Appeal Communication to TC **(Appeal Notice, Brief, Reply Brief)**
- ☐ Proprietary Information
- ☐ Status Letter
- ☑ Other Enclosure(s) (please identify below):
  Facsimile Cover Sheet

Remarks

SIGNATURE OF APPLICANT, ATTORNEY, OR AGENT

Firm Name	Gen-Probe Incorporated		
Signature			
Printed name	Charles B. Cappellari		
Date	January 24, 2005	Reg. No.	40,937

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION/MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being facsimile transmitted to the USPTO or deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date shown below:

Signature			
Typed or printed name	Charles B. Cappellari	Date	January 24, 2005

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

In re Patent Application of:	)	Group Art Unit: 1634
MICHAEL M. BECKER	)	Examiner: Sisson, B.
Serial No. 10/020,596	)	Atty. Docket No. GP123-02.UT
Filed: December 7, 2001	)	Confirmation No. 6565
For: METHOD FOR ENHANCING THE ASSOCIATION RATES OF POLYNUCLEOTIDES	)	**VIA FACSIMILE**

AMENDMENT UNDER 37 C.F.R. § 1.116

Mail Stop AF
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

In response to the Examiner's Final Office Action mailed on November 26, 2004, kindly enter the following amendments and consider the following remarks in connection with the above-captioned application.

Amendments to the Specification

Please amend the paragraph bridging pages 10 and 11 of the specification as follows:

By "polynucleotide" is meant a polymer having two or more nucleoside subunits or nucleobase subunits coupled together. The polynucleotides include DNA and/or RNA or analogs thereof and may further include non-nucleotide groups such as, for example, abasic nucleotides, universal bases (*e.g.*, 3-nitropyrrole and 5-nitroindole), polysaccharides, peptides, polypeptides and/or polyethylene glycol. *See, e.g.*, Becker *et al.*, "Molecular Torches," U.S. Patent No. 6,361,945; Bergstrom *et al.*, "3-Nitropyrrole Nucleoside," U.S. Patent No. 5,681,947; Loakes *et al. Nucleic Acids Research* (1995) 23(13):2361-2366; and Arnold *et al.*, "Linking Reagents for Nucleotide Probes," U.S. Patent No. 5,585,481. The sugar groups of the nucleoside subunits may be ribose, deoxyribose and analogs thereof, including, for example, ribonucleosides having a 2'-O-methyl substitution to the ribofuranosyl moiety. (Polynucleotides including nucleoside subunits having 2' substitutions which are useful as polynucleotide probes are disclosed by Becker *et al.*, "Method for Amplifying Target Nucleic Acid Using Modified Primers," U.S. Patent No. 6,130,038.) The nucleoside subunits may by joined by linkages such as phosphodiester linkages, modified linkages or by non-nucleotide moieties which do not prevent hybridization of the polynucleotide to its complementary target nucleic acid sequence. Modified linkages include those linkages in which a standard phosphodiester linkage is replaced with a different linkage, such as a phosphorothioate linkage or a methylphosphonate linkage. The nucleobase subunits may be joined, for example, by replacing at least a portion of the natural deoxyribose phosphate backbone of DNA with a pseudo peptide backbone, such as a 2-aminoethylglycine backbone which couples the nucleobase subunits by means of a carboxymethyl linker to the central secondary amine. (DNA analogs having a pseudo peptide backbone are commonly referred to as "peptide nucleic acids" or "PNA" and are disclosed by Nielsen *et al.* in U.S. Patent No. 5,773,571.) Other non-limiting examples of polynucleotides contemplated by the present invention include nucleic acid analogs containing bicyclic and tricyclic

nucleoside and nucleotide analogs referred to as "Locked Nucleic Acids," "Locked Nucleoside Analogues" or "LNA." (Locked Nucleic Acids are disclosed by Wang, "Conformationally Locked Nucleosides and Oligonucleotides," U.S. Patent No. 6,083,482; Imanishi *et al.* in U.S. Patent No. 6,268,490; and Wengel *et al.*, "Oligonucleotide Analogues," International Publication No. WO 99/14226 ~~U.S. Patent No. 6,670,461~~.) Any nucleic acid analog is contemplated by the present invention provided the modified polynucleotide can form a stable hybrid with a target nucleic acid under hybridization assay conditions and at least a portion of the modified polynucleotide is anionic. In the case of polynucleotide probes, the modified polynucleotide must be capable of preferentially hybridizing to the target nucleic acid under hybridization assay conditions. Unless indicated to be a "probe," a polynucleotide, as used herein, may be a nucleic acid molecule obtained from a natural source which is at least partially single-stranded or which may be rendered partially or fully single-stranded by human intervention.

Amendment to the Claims

The current status of the claims is as follows:

1. (Previously Presented) A method for determining the presence of a target nucleic acid in a sample, said method comprising:

a) providing to a sample a negatively charged polynucleotide probe and a synthetic, water soluble polycationic polymer, wherein said probe is provided to said sample under conditions permitting said probe to preferentially hybridize to a target nucleic acid, which may be present in said sample, thereby forming a probe:target duplex, and wherein said polymer is provided to said sample in an amount sufficient to increase the association rate of said probe and said target nucleic acid in said sample under said conditions;

b) exposing said sample to a dissociating reagent in an amount sufficient to dissociate said polymer from said duplex after said probe and said target nucleic acid have had sufficient time to associate in said sample; and

c) determining whether said duplex is present in said sample as an indication of the presence or absence of said target nucleic acid.

2. (Original) The method of claim 1, wherein the cationic monomers comprising said polymer are in molar excess of the phosphate groups of said probe.

3. (Original) The method of claim 1, wherein said polymer is a copolymer.

4. (Original) The method of claim 1, wherein said polymer is a graft copolymer.

5. (Original) The method claim 1, wherein said polymer has a delocalized charge.

6. (Original) The method of claim 1, wherein the concentration of said polymer in said sample is in the range of about 10 μM to about 100 μM.

7. (Original) The method of claim 1, wherein said polymer has a weight average molecular weight of less than about 300,000 Da.

8. (Original) The method of claim 1, wherein said probe includes multiple interacting labels and comprises first and second base regions which hybridize to each other under said conditions in the absence of said target nucleic acid, wherein said labels interact with each other to produce a first detectable signal when said probe is not hybridized to said target nucleic acid and a second detectable signal when said probe is hybridized to said target nucleic acid, and wherein said first and second signals are detectably different from each other.

9. (Original) The method of claim 8, wherein said probe includes a third base region which hybridizes to said target nucleic acid under said conditions, and wherein said third base region is distinct from said first and second base regions or said third base region partially or fully overlaps at least one of said first and second base regions of said probe.

10. (Original) The method of claim 1, wherein said probe is a polyanion.

11. (Original) The method of claim 10, wherein said probe further includes at least one of a cationic group and a nonionic group.

12. (Original) The method of claim 10, wherein the distance between adjacent cationic monomers of said polymer approximates the distance between adjacent phosphate groups of said probe and said target nucleic acid.

13. (Original) The method of claim 1, wherein said target nucleic acid comprises RNA.

14. (Original) The method of claim 13, wherein said RNA is ribosomal RNA.

15. (Original) The method of claim 13, wherein said RNA is messenger RNA.

16. (Original) The method of claim 1, wherein a complex comprising said polymer is formed in said sample under said conditions.

17. (Original) The method of claim 16, wherein said complex includes a plurality of polymers which are covalently linked.

18. (Original) The method of claim 16 wherein said complex includes polymers and polynucleotides which are covalently linked.

19. (Original) The method of claim 16, wherein said complex is water soluble.

20. (Original) The method of claim 1, wherein said probe and said polymer are in solution during the formation of said duplex.

21. (Original) The method of claim 1, wherein the association rate of said probe and said target nucleic acid under said conditions and in the presence of said polymer is at least about 2-fold greater than the association rate of said probe and said target nucleic acid under said conditions and in the absence of said polymer.

22. (Original) The method of claim 1, wherein the association rate of said probe and said target nucleic acid under said conditions and in the presence of said polymer is at least about 5-fold greater than the association rate of said probe and said target nucleic acid under said conditions and in the absence of said polymer.

23. (Original) The method of claim 1, wherein the association rate of said probe and said target nucleic acid under said conditions and in the presence of said polymer is at least about 10-fold greater than the association rate of said probe and said target nucleic acid under said conditions and in the absence of said polymer.

24. (Original) The method of claim 1, wherein the association rate of said probe and said target nucleic acid under said conditions and in the presence of said polymer is at least about 100-fold greater than the association rate of said probe and said target nucleic acid under said conditions and in the absence of said polymer.

25. (Original) The method of claim 1, wherein the association rate of said probe and said target nucleic acid under said conditions and in the presence of said polymer is at least about 1000-fold greater than the association rate of said probe and said target nucleic acid under said conditions and in the absence of said polymer.

26. (Canceled)

27. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 1, wherein said dissociating reagent is at least one of a polyanion or an anionic detergent.

28. (Original) The method of claim 1, wherein said conditions include a temperature of at least about 40°C and a salt concentration of at least about 5 mM monovalent cations or an equivalent salt concentration containing multivalent cations.

29. (Original) The method of claim 28, wherein said temperature is up to about 60°C.

30. (Original) The method of claim 1, wherein said conditions include a temperature of at least about 40°C and a salt concentration of at least about 150 mM monovalent cations or an equivalent salt concentration containing multivalent cations.

31. (Original) The method of claim 30, wherein said temperature is up to about 60°C.

32. (Original) The method of claim 1, wherein said polymer is provided to said sample before said probe.

33. (Canceled)

34. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 1, wherein said determining step is diagnostic for the presence or absence of a virus or organism or members of a group of viruses or organisms in said sample.

35. (Original) The method of claim 34, wherein said probe stably hybridizes to one or more nucleic acid sequences present in said sample having at least a single base difference from said target nucleic acid sequence.

36. (Currently Amended) The method of claim ~~33~~ 1, wherein said probe includes a label.

Claims 37-60 (Canceled)

61. (Previously Presented) The method of claim 1, wherein said probe and said polymer are independently provided to said sample.

Remarks

Claims 1-25, 27-32, 34-36 and 61 are presently pending in the subject application.

Reconsideration and allowance in view of the above amendments and the following remarks are respectfully requested.

The specification and claim 36 have been amended herein in the manner described below.

Objections to the Specification

The Examiner objects to Applicant's incorporation by reference of entire documents in the specification on the grounds that Applicant has not indicated why the referenced documents are being incorporated and that Applicant has not identified which portions of the documents are considered to be relevant. In response, Applicant first observes that there is no affirmative duty to state in a specification, as the Examiner suggests, why a particular documented is being incorporated by reference. *See* MPEP § 608.01(p) at 600-82 (8th ed., Rev. 2, May 2004). Second, Applicant submits that there is no obligation to point to the relevant portions of a document when an applicant believes, and the context suggests, that the referenced document as a whole is relevant. In the present case, Applicant has incorporated by reference, *inter alia*, documents which disclose methods for extracting nucleic acids for use in detection assays, different types of amplification procedures, methods and means for detecting nucleic acids, and particular kinds of nucleic acid analogs. The referenced documents provide information such as compositions, processes, reagents and conditions. Thus, given the context of each incorporation by reference in the specification, Applicant submits that those skilled in the art would readily appreciate the relevance of incorporated documents in their entireties. Therefore, if this rejection is to be maintained, then Applicant requests that the Examiner state with particularity why each incorporated document should be limited to a particular section and what section of each such document the Examiner believes the disclosure should be limited to.

Applicant's Reply filed on August 26, 2004 is objected to by the Examiner for introducing new matter into the disclosure. In support of this objection, the Examiner first argues that the insertion of language in the specification that various documents have been incorporated by reference constitutes new matter. This is not the case since Applicant's specification, as filed, incorporated all documents referred to in the specification by reference in their entireties. *See* specification at page 1, lines 15-16. Thus, to now limit those documents incorporated by reference to a subset of those originally incorporated by reference cannot constitute new matter.

Second, the Examiner objects to the substitution of U.S. patent applications [*sic*, U.S. patents] for foreign applications in Applicant's prior Reply. To clarify, in those instances where an international application was listed in combination with a U.S. application, the reference to the U.S. application was substituted with a reference to the U.S. patent that issued directly therefrom and the reference to the international application was simply deleted. In one case, there was a reference to an international application that was substituted with a reference to a corresponding U.S. patent. Rather than filing a declaration or affidavit in support of this latter change to the specification, Applicant has elected to amend the specification to re-identify the international application that was previously deleted. *See* amendment to the paragraph bridging pages 10 and 11 of the specification.

Finally, Applicant's prior Reply amended page 4, lines 15-16, of the specification to indicate that the polynucleotide probes of the claimed invention have net "negative" charge rather than a net "positive" charge, as Applicant inadvertently stated in the originally filed application. In objecting to this amendment, the Examiner seems to assert that Applicant's disclosure provides that the polynucleotides bind to the polycations to form a complex that is negatively charged rather than that the polynucleotides alone are negatively charged. The Examiner's conclusion is in discord with the clear teaching of the specification, which provides as follows:

> . . . the applicant currently believes that the polycationic polymers of the present invention assemble in solution to form complexes of nanometer dimensions (*i.e.*, nonoparticles) which create a charge environment that attracts negatively charged polynucleotides (*e.g.*, polynucleotide probes and target nucleic acids) present in the solution.

See specification at paragraph bridging pages 29 and 30 (emphasis added). Thus, Applicant's disclosure makes it is indisputable that the polynucleotides of the claimed invention must be negatively charged. Moreover, contrary to the Examiner's reading of the description, the section of the specification where the inadvertent error occurred is limited to a discussion of polynucleotides useful in the present invention and not to a complex made up of both polynucleotides and polycations. *See* specification at page 4, lines 14-25. In this section of the specification, Applicant also discloses that the polynucleotides must have anionic groups and may consist of RNA or DNA. And if, as disclosed, a polynucleotide may consist of RNA or DNA, then it cannot have a net positive charge. Therefore, Applicant's submit that use of the phrase "net positive charge" was a clear error that would have been readily recognized by those having ordinary skill in the art.

For the reasons provided above, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the Examiner's objections to the specification.

Objection to the Claims

Claim 36 is objected to by the Examiner under 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(c) as being of improper dependent form. In response, Applicant has amended claim 36 herein to depend from claim 1. Accordingly, withdrawal of the Examiner's objection to claim 36 is respectfully requested.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-25, 27-32, 34-36 and 61 stand rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for the reasons that follow.

Under this rejection, the Examiner first argues that claim 1 covers "simultaneous detection of an infinite number of target nucleic acids." First, assuming *arguendo* that the Examiner's assertion is true, the Examiner has failed to state why the detection of multiple target nucleic acids would raise a written description issue since the stated objective of the claim is to detect target nucleic acid. (An example of multiple target nucleic acids contemplated by the claims is extracted nucleic acid and a nucleic acid amplification product thereof, where the extracted nucleic acid and the amplification product contain the same target nucleic acid sequence, excluding RNA and DNA equivalents.) Second, the Examiner has made no attempt to explain what this potentially "infinite" set of target nucleic acids would be comprised of and how this potentially infinite set of target nucleic acids would wind-up in the sample being interrogated. Third, Applicant submits that this rejection fails to take into consideration all the limitations of the claim, as the claim specifically recites that the probe will "preferentially hybridize" to the target nucleic acid, thereby indicating the presence of a specific target nucleic acid sequence. *See, e.g.*, specification at page 13, line 3 *et seq.*

The Examiner states that the examples are limited to experiments involving just six different polycationic polymers. Applicant is unaware, however, of any obligation to provide examples to satisfy the written description requirement, and the Examiner has failed to identify any such obligation. Additionally, the Examiner's statement that Applicant has exemplified a limited number of polycationic polymers is not evidence or reasoning that Applicant has failed to adequately describe the claimed invention. Also, the specification goes to great lengths to describe the features of polycationic polymers that can be used in the claimed method. *See, e.g.*, specification page 27, line 24 *et seq*. Therefore, if this rejection is to be maintained, then evidence or reasoning in support thereof is respectfully requested. *See* MPEP § 2163.04 at 2100-173 (8th ed., Rev. Feb. 2003).

It is further argued by the Examiner that step b) of claim 1 only requires that the reactants be exposed to a "dissociation [*sic*, dissociating] reagent in amount sufficient to dissociate said polymer from said duplex." This is true, but only in part. Step b) of claim 1 further requires

that the sample be exposed to the dissociating reagent after the probe and target nucleic acid have had sufficient time to associate in the sample, thereby excluding reagents present in the sample before the probe and target nucleic acid have had sufficient time to associate. Examples of dissociating reagents are provided in the specification at page 7, lines 5-11, and page 37, lines 25-26.

The Examiner further contends that the claims do not require that the dissociating reagent be provided under conditions that will result in dissociation, nor do the claims require that any dissociation take place. As noted by the Examiner, the claims require that the sample be exposed to a dissociating reagent "in an amount sufficient to dissociate said polymer from said duplex." Thus, if the conditions of an assay are such that dissociation of the polymer from the probe:target nucleic acid duplex cannot take place, then the dissociating reagent has not been provided to the sample in an amount sufficient to dissociate the polymer from the probe:target nucleic acid duplex and this limitation of the claim has not been satisfied. Furthermore, a reason that the claim does not require that dissociation occur is because the claim does not require that the target nucleic acid even be present in the sample, as the claims are directed to a method for determining whether the target nucleic acid is present in the sample.

The Examiner concludes this rejection by suggesting that Applicant is attempting to satisfy the written description requirement through obviousness. But this conclusion is unsupported by any facts, especially by any references to statements made on the record by Applicant. Since the Examiner has not provided Applicant with any basis for responding to this argument, and Applicant has been diligent to respond to all of the Examiner's rejections with references to the description, no response can be made to the Examiner's contention without engaging in conjecture.

Based on the foregoing, Applicant submits that the written description requirement has been satisfied and, therefore, withdrawal of the Examiner's written description rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-25, 27-32, 34-36 and 61 stand rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for the reasons that follow.

The Examiner states that claim 1 encompasses the detection of any number of different target polynucleotides with any one or more probes in a simultaneous manner where no label or detection means is employed. From this statement, it is difficult to ascertain the exact basis or bases for the Examiner's rejection. Nevertheless, the Examiner is first directed to Applicant's response to the written description rejection above, where the importance of the probe's claimed ability to preferentially hybridize to the target nucleic acid is discussed. Further, while it is true that claim 1 does not specify a label, Applicant wishes to point out that detection means are available, and well known in the art, that do not require the presence of a label for detection of a probe hybridized to a target nucleic acid. *See, e.g.*, specification at page 17, lines 4-12. Finally, Applicant has disclosed a number of non-limiting labels for detecting probes hybridized to target nucleic acids (*see, e.g.*, specification at page 27, lines 3-22), heterogenous and homogenous systems that are well known in the art (*see, e.g.*, specification at page 35, line 24 *et seq.*), as well as instrument systems for performing detection assays (*see, e.g.*, specification at page 40, lines 4-18).

The Examiner contends that the claimed method encompasses performing all the steps with the reactants in solution and no apparent means for retaining the duplex should one reactant be removed from the solution. It would appear that the Examiner is arguing that Applicant's claims cover both heterogenous and homogenous assays. As noted above, both types of assays are described in the specification at, for example, page 35, line 24 *et seq*. The contents of the documents cited in this section of the specification are all incorporated by reference in their entireties.

The Examiner also contends that the phrase "forming a duplex" in the claims encompasses both duplex and triplex structures. This interpretation of the term "duplex," however,

is contradicted by Applicant's definition, which provides that a "duplex" is a stable nucleic acid structure comprising a double-stranded, hydrogen-bonded region. *See* specification at page 17, lines 1-4. Thus, the claims require that the probe and the target nucleic acid form a double-stranded bond, or duplex, rather than a triplex structure. And even if triplex structures were covered by the claims, the Examiner has failed to explain why the enablement requirement is not satisfied by Applicant's disclosure. Therefore, if this rejection is to be maintained, then evidence or reasoning in support thereof is respectfully requested. *See* MPEP § 2163.04 at 2100-173 (8th ed., Rev. Feb. 2003).

The Examiner submits that the clause "in an amount sufficient to increase the association rate of said probe an [*sic*, and] said target nucleic acid" encompasses "values that both allow for an [*sic*, and] exceed this increased rate of association." As stated, Applicant is unable to determine what the basis is for the Examiner's rejection. The claims specify that the presence of the polycationic polymer in the sample increases the rate at which the polynucleotide probe and the target nucleic acid associate. If the claims require an increased rate of association, as they do, then it is unclear how the claim can be interpreted to also cover values which "exceed this increased rate of association." Put another way, if the claim specifies an increased rate of association, then there is no value that could exceed this increased rate of association since no upper limit is specified. Therefore, if this rejection is to be maintained, then evidence or reasoning in support thereof is respectfully requested. *See* MPEP § 2163.04 at 2100-173 (8th ed., Rev. Feb. 2003).

The Examiner further submits that the phrase "polycationic polymer" encompasses both organic and inorganic polycationic polymers, exhibiting a range of hydrophobicity and hydrophilicity, and can have virtually any upper mass. This, however, is not evidence or reasoning that Applicant has failed to adequately enable the claimed invention. Moreover, the specification goes to great lengths to describe the features of polycationic polymers that can be used in the claimed method. *See, e.g.*, specification at page 6, lines 21-26, and page 27, line 24 *et seq*. Therefore, if this

rejection is to be maintained, then evidence or reasoning in support thereof is respectfully requested. *See* MPEP § 2163.04 at 2100-173 (8th ed., Rev. Feb. 2003).

The Examiner correctly observes that the claims require conditions such that the probe preferentially hybridizes to the target nucleic acid. Yet, the Examiner goes on to state, without any evidence or reasoning, that such language encompasses "the formation of duplex structures with non-target sequences in nearly equal amounts." As Applicant has previously stressed, the Examiner's interpretation is directly contradicted by the definitions section of the application, where the phrase "preferentially hybridize" is defined to mean "that under the specified hybridization assay conditions, polynucleotide probes can hybridize to their target nucleic acids to form stable probe:target hybrids indicating the presence of a specific target nucleic acid sequence, and there is not formed a sufficient number of stable probe:non-target hybrids to indicate the presence of non-target nucleic acids." *See* specification at page 13, lines 3-15 (emphasis added). If this rejection is to be maintained, then Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner's conclusion be properly supported with evidence or reasoning. *See* MPEP § 2163.04 at 2100-173 (8th ed., Rev. Feb. 2003).

The Examiner urges that the examples provided in the specification do not fully enable the claimed invention. Similar to Applicant's response to the Examiner's written description rejection, Applicant submits that a limited number of examples is not, standing alone, evidence or reasoning that Applicant has failed to fully enable the claimed invention. Further, in addition to the examples, the specification goes to great lengths to describe the features of polycationic polymers that can be used in the claimed method. *See, e.g.,* specification at page 6, lines 21-26, and page 27, line 24 *et seq*. Therefore, if this rejection is to be maintained, then evidence or reasoning in support thereof is respectfully requested. *See* MPEP § 2163.04 at 2100-173 (8th ed., Rev. Feb. 2003).

Finally, based on the arguments in support of the written description rejection, the Examiner concludes that Applicant cannot enable that which he did not possess at the time the

instant application was filed. For the reasons set forth above, Applicant submits the written description clearly demonstrates that he was in possession of the claimed invention at the time the instant application was filed and, accordingly, that the claimed invention is fully enabled.

Based on the foregoing, Applicant submits that the presently claimed invention is fully enabled and, therefore, withdrawal of the Examiner's enablement rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-25, 27-32, 34-36 and 61 stand rejected by the Examiner under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as failing to set forth the subject matter which Applicant regards as his invention. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection for the reasons that follow.

The Examiner contends that the presently pending claims do not correspond in scope with that which Applicant regards as the invention. To support this contention, the Examiner points to the "Field of the Invention" section of the specification and to the originally filed claims. In particular, the Examiner contends that the claims are now drawn to a method of determining the presence of a target nucleic acid. This rejection is not understood, as Applicant's original claim 33 recited determining whether the duplex has formed in the sample. (The limitation of former claim 33 was incorporated into claim 1 in Applicant's prior Reply.) Additionally, the specification very clearly discloses detecting the formation of probe:target nucleic acid duplexes. *See, e.g.*, the specification at page 4, lines 4-13, and the paragraph bridging pages 5 and 6. The specification also contemplates detecting the presence or amount of probe bound to a target nucleic acid. *See, e.g.*, the specification at page 35, lines 24-27. Accordingly, Applicant submits that the claims correspond in scope with the disclosure and, therefore, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Conclusion

Applicant submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

No fee is believed due in connection with this Amendment. If Applicant is mistaken, please charge the amount due to Deposit Account No. 07-0835 in the name of Gen-Probe Incorporated.

Certificate of Transmission

I hereby certify that this correspondence (and any referred to as attached) is being sent by facsimile to 703-872-9306 on the date indicated below to the Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: January 24, 2005

By: _____

Charles B. Cappellari
Registration No. 40,937
Attorney for Applicant

GEN-PROBE INCORPORATED
Patent Department
10210 Genetic Center Drive
San Diego, California 92121
PH: 858-410-8927
FAX: 858-410-8928

MEMORY TRANSMISSION REPORT

PAGE : 001
TIME : JAN-24-2005 10:55AM
TEL NUMBER1: +1 858 410 8928
TEL NUMBER2:
NAME : Gen-Probe Incorporated - Patent Dept.

FILE NUMBER : 367

DATE : JAN-24 10:48AM

TO : ☎917038729306

DOCUMENT PAGES : 021

START TIME : JAN-24 10:49AM

END TIME : JAN-24 10:55AM

SENT PAGES : 021

STATUS : OK

FILE NUMBER : 367 *** SUCCESSFUL TX NOTICE ***

FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

FROM: Charles B. Cappellari
Gen-Probe Incorporated
10210 Genetic Center Drive
San Diego, California 92121
Phone No. (858) 410-8927
Facsimile No. (858) 410-8928

TO: Examiner: Sisson, B.
Group 1634
U.S. Patent & Trademark Office
Facsimile No. (703) 872-9306

Number of pages (including this cover page): 21

In re Patent Application of:	)	Group Art Unit: 1634
MICHAEL M. BECKER	)	Examiner: Sisson, B.
Serial No. 10/020,596	)	Atty. Docket No. GP123-02.UT
Filed: December 7, 2001	)	Confirmation No. 6565
Title: METHOD FOR ENHANCING THE ASSOCIATION RATES OF POLYNUCLEOTIDES	)	Date: January 24, 2005

Transmitted herewith are:

1) Transmittal Form PTO/SB/21 (1 pg.); and
2) Amendment Under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 (19 pgs.)

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION

I hereby certify that this correspondence (and any referred to as attached) is being sent by facsimile to 703-872-9306 on the date indicated below to the Mail Stop AF, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

Date: January 24, 2005

By: _____
Charles B. Cappellari
Registration No. 40,937
Attorney for Applicant